



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,723	05/14/2001	Michael L. Heubel	BELL-0068/00248	8659
38952	7590	07/06/2004	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			FOX, BRYAN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2686	
DATE MAILED: 07/06/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10
M

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/854,723	HEUBEL ET AL.
	Examiner Bryan J Fox	Art Unit 2686

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/8/2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: an unnecessary period is present in the beginning of line 9. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 5-11 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy et al. (US006377825B1) in view of Meidan et al. (US005509048A) and further in view of Singh (US 20020115477A1).

Regarding claim 1, Kennedy et al. discloses a hands-free wireless communication system with an interface module (see column 2, lines 30-32) between a wireless communication device and car (see column 1, lines 6-9) including a data port to receive data from the wireless device (see column 6, lines 27-34 and figure 3), which

reads on the claimed "first data port that is adapted to be coupled to the data output port of the portable communications device, the first data port for receiving data from the portable communications device". Also, the interface may include an interface 348 for interconnecting the interface module 106 to various external subsystems 378 (see column 7, lines 60-62 and figure 3) and external subsystems 378 may include a screen for displaying textual information (see column 27, lines 47-50). Kennedy et al. fails to teach that the remote display device is a projection display device.

Meidan et al. discloses the use of a projection display in conjunction with a wireless device (see column 3, lines 36-41 and figure 8).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kennedy et al. with Meidan et al. to include the projection display in order to provide an easy to read display in a car. The combination of Kennedy et al. and Meidan et al. fails to expressly disclose that the information from the cellular telephone is received from a remote location.

Singh discloses a system where an image is sent from a host computer 1 to a cellular telephone 12, which is connected to the portable high speed internet access device 18 of the invention and the portable device 18 displays it for viewing to the user 3 (see page 2, paragraph 21 and figure 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kennedy et al. and Meidan et al. to include the above receiving of remote information in order to allow information to be gathered

from a wide variety of sources such as the Internet, as suggested by Singh (see page 2, paragraph 21).

Regarding claim 5, 6, and 7, the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh discloses that the wireless device may be any communication device capable of wireless communication (see Kennedy et al. column 1, lines 5-9).

Regarding claim 8, the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh discloses that the screen 278 is positioned at a windshield portion of the vehicle 199 (see Meidan et al. column 6, lines 15-16 and figures 2 and 8).

Regarding claim 9, the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh discloses that the visual signal display 172 (see Meidan et al. figure 1) comprises a heads-up display in a vehicle (see Meidan et al. column 4, lines 58-59 and figures 2 and 8).

Regarding claim 10, Kennedy et al. discloses a hands-free wireless communication system in a vehicle including a data port to receive data from the wireless device (see column 6, lines 27-34 and figure 3), the wireless device having a connector 116 that provides data to the interface (see column 6, lines 27-30), which reads on the claimed "portable communications device having an externally accessible data output port". The interface includes a pocket 104 that holds the telephone 102 securely in place (see column 6, lines 30-31 and figure 1A), which reads on the claimed "cradle comprising a housing that is adapted to receive the portable communication device". The pocket also includes an electrical connector 124 that connects to the phone connector 116 described above (see column 6, lines 1-5), which reads on the

claimed "interface for coupling the data output of the portable communications device to the housing", and also the interface may include an interface 348 for interconnecting the interface module 106 to various external subsystems 378 (see column 7, lines 60-62 and figure 3) and external subsystems 378 may include a screen for displaying textual information (see column 27, lines 47-50). The system disclosed by Kennedy et al. further includes a processor 348 for communicating with the external systems 378 as can be seen in figure 3. The processor converts telephone control and other signals between the proprietary interface of the communications device and the application programming device of the system, which reads on the claimed invention with a processor for receiving the communications data via the first interface and forwarding the received data to the remote projection display device via the second interface in a suitable format. The system disclosed by Kennedy et al. fails to teach the use of a projection display.

Meidan et al. discloses the use of a projection display in conjunction with a wireless device (see column 3, lines 36-41 and figure 8).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kennedy et al. with Meidan et al. to include the projection display in order to provide an easy to read display in a car. The combination of Kennedy et al. and Meidan et al. fails to expressly disclose that the information from the cellular telephone is received from a remote location.

Singh discloses a system where an image is sent from a host computer 1 to a cellular telephone 12, which is connected to the portable high speed internet access

device 18 of the invention and the portable device 18 displays it for viewing to the user 3 (see page 2, paragraph 21 and figure 1).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kennedy et al. and Meidan et al. to include the above receiving of remote information in order to allow information to be gathered from a wide variety of sources such as the Internet, as suggested by Singh (see page 2, paragraph 21).

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh discloses that a wire 290 and may be used to connect to the projecting element 284 (see Meidan et al. column 6, lines 29-32 and figure 2).

Regarding claim 15, the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh discloses the use of a serial bus (see Kennedy et al. column 9, lines 65-66), which reads on the claimed "first interface is a serial port connector and the second interface is a serial port connector".

Regarding claim 16, the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh discloses a system where a pocket connects a telephone to an interface both mechanically and electrically (see Kennedy et al. column 5, line 63 – column 6, line 10 and figure 1A), which reads on the claimed "a connection between the first interface and the data output port of the portable communications device is achieved upon receipt of the portable communications device into the housing".

Claims 2, 3, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy et al. in view of Meidan et al. and Singh as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of Klausner (US006489934B1).

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh fails to expressly disclose the reformatting of the display in the manner claimed.

Klausner discloses a cellular phone with a built in projector display with a display controller 5 that formats the received data to provide the properly formatted data to display driver 6 for subsequent display (see column 3, lines 35-59 and figure 2), which reads on the claimed data translator that "formats the data received from the portable communications device into the format from which the remote projection display device can provide the projected display".

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh with Klausner to include the above reformatting display in order to provide the user with a more readable display of data.

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh fails to expressly disclose the use of a scrolling display as claimed.

Klausner teaches the use of a display where the user scrolls through pages (see column 1, lines 30-35). The scrolling device must include a means to control the scrolling as well.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh with Klausner to

include the above scrolling display in order to provide the user with a way to view information that is too large for his display.

Regarding claim 13, the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh fails to teach the reformatting of the display in the manner claimed.

Klausner discloses a cellular phone with a built in projector display with a display controller 5 that formats the received data to provide the properly formatted data to display driver 6 for subsequent display (see column 3, lines 35-59 and figure 2), which reads on the claimed data translator that "formats the data received from the portable communications device into the format from which the remote projection display device can provide the projected display".

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh with Klausner to include the above reformatting display in order to provide the user with a more readable display of data.

Regarding claim 14, the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh fails to teach the use of a scrolling display.

Klausner teaches the use of a display where the user scrolls through pages (see column 1, lines 30-35). The scrolling display must include a means to control the scrolling as well.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh with Klausner to

include the above scrolling display in order to provide the user with a way to view information that is too large for his display.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Kennedy et al., Meidan et al, Singh and Klausner as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Tsai (US006339700B1).

The combination of Kennedy et al., Meidan et al, Singh and Klausner fails to teach the use of a steering wheel to control the functions of a phone.

Tsai teaches a telephone dialer mounted on a steering wheel (see column 2, lines 20-29).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al, Singh and Klausner to include a control device on the steering wheel in order to allow a user to control a mobile phone without needing to turn his head during driving.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy et al. in view of Meidan et al. and Singh as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Lebby et al. (US006115618A).

The combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh fails to disclose the use of a wireless link in the interface module.

Lebby et al. discloses a portable electronic device with removable display and a wireless communication port 29, as a means for communication of signals between the remote display and portable communications equipment (see column 3, lines 2-7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Kennedy et al, Meidan et al. and Singh with Lebby et al. to include the above wireless link in order to eliminate the need to have another wire installed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-11 and 13-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Erkkilä et al. (US006219560B1) discloses a modular mobile communication system.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan J Fox whose telephone number is (703) 305-8994. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (703) 305-4379. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

BJF

Nguyen Vo
6-28-04

NGUYEN T. VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER